

Date: Sat, 6 Feb 93 04:30:21 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #32  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sat, 6 Feb 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    32

Today's Topics:

                    Abandonment of CW  
            How can a WA4xxx call belong to a novice?  
            Net Control Signing for others on Net  
            Pres. Clinton speech via Packet?  
            You may still be asked to send code!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 3 Feb 93 23:36:17 GMT  
From: saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!mane.cgrg.ohio-state.edu!  
arrakis!wrdis01!sberman@ames.arpa  
Subject: Abandonment of CW  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> CW is a fun mode, one which I often enjoy. However, arguing the  
>preservation  
>of CW just because we've always used it is pointless and contrary to the  
>charter of our service. If we do not achieve the goals of our service, the  
>FCC \*will\* eventually re-direct amateur radio. I would suggest it is time  
>for us (the amateurs) to pro-actively petition the FCC to de-emphasize the  
>archaic facets of radio and emphasize the modern facets.  
>  
> For the record, I recently achieved my Extra class license. I have nothing  
>to gain from the abolition of 13 and 20 WPM requirements.

Congratulations! You are one of the few Extra class higher-ups who realizes

the futility of CW wpm requirements. As for me, I still have trouble with 5wpm!

```
/=====\  
|                                     Steve Berman                                     |  
|      |\\\      sberman@wrdis01.robins.af.mil      WR-ALC/LKS      |  
|      |#\ ^\      Robins AFB, GA      |  
|      |##\ ^\      |  
|      |###>////> CENTECH      JOINT STARS      |  
|      |##////// Century Technologies, Inc.      Depot Support      |  
|      |#////      |  
|      |//      (912) 926-1237      |  
|                                     |  
\=====/
```

-----  
Date: Wed, 3 Feb 1993 21:40:07 GMT  
From: unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!  
pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!linac!att!mcdchg!laidbak!tellab5!cuuxb!nsscmail!  
ulysses!ulysses.att.com!wmb@@mvp.saic.com  
Subject: How can a WA4xxx call belong to a novice?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

rossi@gvlf9-q.gvl.unisys.com (Pete Rossi) writes:  
>I worked a station in the novice roundup this past weekend with a 2 X 3  
>WA4xxx type call. He was signing /N.  
>How can this be? Back in the 70's before the current callsign structure

jmcoving@unccsun.uncc.edu (John Covington WN4BBJ) writes:  
> In late 1977 and early 1978, the FCC allowed you to request any previously  
> held callsign as long as it was not held by someone else within the last  
> year (renewal grace period). So it's possible that this person had the  
> WA4 callsign years back, and got a Novice license in 1977 and then  
> requested their previous callsign.  
>  
> Here's an even more interesting Novice call from the server:  
>  
> Call-Sign: K4BVJ Class: NOVICE  
> ..  
> This person was obviously licensed as a Technician or higher around 1955,  
> and allowed their license to expire, and picked up their old call  
> in 1977 or 1978. Very few Novice 1x3s!

I recall reading about a similarly-relicensed Novice in this area with a 1x2 call (K2VN..?). Very few of those, I bet..

Bill Brelsford, K2DI

wmb@joplin.att.com

-----  
Date: Wed, 3 Feb 1993 23:43:45 GMT  
From: csus.edu!netcom.com!steve@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Net Control Signing for others on Net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Pine.3.04.9301271136.A12343-b1000000@pennsy.med.jhu.edu>, phillips@pennsy.med.jhu.EDU (Mark D. Phillips) writes:  
> A local ham has been telling me that when I participate in a Net, I do  
> not need to identify at the end because "Net Control signs for all  
> check-ins and participants at the conclusion of the net."  
>  
> I have been suspicious of this, as I understand the regs to say that  
> \_I\_ am the one responsible for identifying my transmissions.

I don't need to go much farther than this. You are correct. You are the control operator of YOUR station and consequently responsible for IDing your station. End of discussion. The only station that NC can ID legally is themselves.

Whoever is passing out such info really ought to be directed to a current copy of the rules/regs for a refresher course.

> --> If this is within the rules, I would like to see a reference to the  
> specific section of the regulations that allows this. <--

I don't ave a copy in front of me....but in summary as a control op you are required to ID at the end of a group of transmissions,i.e. signing off and every 10 minutes during a conversation.

>  
> Mark D. Phillips, Ph.D. -- W03M  
> wo3m@wb3ffv.md.usa.noam

Steve KA6S

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Feb 1993 14:51:28 GMT  
From: gondor.sdsu.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!torn!nott!cunews!freenet.carleton.ca!Freenet.carleton.ca!aa367@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Pres. Clinton speech via Packet?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Good on ya Dave, you tell em.  
by the way the SW bands here in Nth America are just loaded up  
full of this doubtfull use doubtfull international broadcasters  
who just move to some little nation near the Us and pay some one  
a little pile of cash and up they come all over the spectrum  
thumbing their bibles and saying  
gib me money  
gib me money  
just ring me up and give me your money stupid..  
sorry thing is IT works. any nut can become king of the airways  
if he can get the calls to 1 800 \*\*\*\*\* funny how 800 is  
really only Nth America  
Now for all those f  
religious nuts  
may you chooks turn into emus and kick your dunny door down...  
--

-----  
Date: 5 Feb 93 03:42:58 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: You may still be asked to send code!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I was reading Part 97 (nothing like a good read to find the weirdities  
in this document) and I came across this near the back of the book:

#### 97.509 Administering and Examination

(b) Each examinee must comply with the instructions given by the  
administering VEs.

(d) Passing a telegraphy examination is adequate proof of an examinee's  
ability to send and receive telegraphy. The administrating VEs,  
however, MAY ALSO INCLUDE A SENDING SEGMENT IN A TELEGRAPHY EXAMINATION.

[My emphasis].

#### Questions:

1. Does the first sentence imply that if you can pass the receiving  
test then it doesn't matter if you can send a single dit.
2. Can a VE fail you if you refuse to send any code (on the basis of  
97.509 (b))? "What's that thing ... I can't do that" :-)
3. Has anyone see a VE give a sending test?

What do they ARRL and W5YI VEC rule books say?

This could be a boon for the "this ain't like my test at the FCC office" OFs :-)

Beats arguing about no-code!

72/73 Kevin, N7WIM / G8UDP  
a-kevinp@microsoft.com

-----  
Date: 4 Feb 1993 19:44:10 GMT  
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C1Mv2v.sp@amdcl2>, <1kfnc3INNcjd@network.ucsd.edu>,  
<3141@eram.esi.COM.AU>  
Subject : Re: Pres. Clinton speech via Packet?

In article <3141@eram.esi.COM.AU> dave@eram.esi.COM.AU (Dave Horsfall) writes:  
>| Sometimes you need a lot of text to test with. Shakespeare is about 6  
>| megabytes, by the way.  
>Just curious; where are these texts on-line?

I got them from a researcher here on campus who was doing a concordance and other things. I know you can get them from many places, such as the DAK home library, the free disk that comes with the NeXT, etc.

In my case, I had to delete a bunch of diacritical and punctuation marks from the text to restore it to plaintext, but once that's done, it's public domain.

I'd offer to mail it to you, but it IS 6 megabytes, after all. Probably Archie can find an FTP site near you that has it.

- Brian

-----  
Date: 4 Feb 1993 19:40:24 GMT  
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <p2fs3xa@dixie.com>, <1kn8qcINNes0@tamsun.tamu.edu>,  
<4jmswaa@dixie.com>  
Subject : Re: all of this closed repeater stuff

In article <4jmswaa@dixie.com> jgd@dixie.com (John De Armond) writes:

>You really WORK at being a bozo, don't you?

Yes, John, I've seen Kurt sweat and struggle to be a bozo. Apparently it's quite a lot of work for him.

With you, on the other hand, being a bozo seems to come effortlessly.  
- Brian

-----  
Date: Wed, 03 Feb 93 21:01:21 GMT  
From: pacbell.com!sgiblab!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
paladin.american.edu!gatech!emory!rsiatl!jgd@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <107058@netnews.upenn.edu>, <p2fs3xa@dixie.com>,  
<1kn8qcINNes0@tamsun.tamu.edu>.  
Subject : Re: all of this closed repeater stuff

kurt@cs.tamu.edu (Kurt Freiburger) writes:

>|> support is \$xx per year. If, after a couple of direct suggestions the  
>|> guy does not pony up, write him off as a deadbeat and ignore him. Don't  
> ^^^  
>WHAT????!!! Trample his God-given RIGHTS to USE your OPEN, repeat, OPEN  
>repeater? If you discriminate ONE time, you have effectively created a  
>closed repeater system, by the Georgia rules..... Here you have hindered  
>his full use of the facilities by making him a pariah.

You really WORK at being a bozo, don't you? Writing someone off as a deadbeat and ignoring him does NOT (at least nowhere except Texas) mean doing ANYTHING to keep him from using the open repeater other than ignoring him. If he wants to talk with one of his deadbeat buddies, let him. No skin off my back. Of course, no one around here runs a commercial common carrier service that tries to masquerade as an amateur "cactus net". I guess that is the fundamental difference between your group and ours, eh?

Tellya what Kurt. Next time you come to Atlanta, hop up on 443.65, PL 118.8, and give a call and we'll demonstrate how to ignore an undesirable. (Actually I'd probably return your CQ so as to bait you in person but humor me for a moment.)

John

--

John De Armond, WD40QC	Interested in high performance mobility?
Performance Engineering Magazine(TM)	Interested in high tech and computers?
Marietta, Ga	Send ur snail-mail address to
jgd@dixie.com	perform@dixie.com for a free sample mag

Need Usenet public Access in Atlanta? Write Me for info on Dixie.com.

-----

Date: 5 Feb 93 18:30:39 GMT  
From: ogicse!emory!rsiatl!jgd@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1kn8qcINNes0@tamsun.tamu.edu>, <4jmswaa@dixie.com>,  
<1krrf8INNo6d@network.ucsd.edu>  
Subject : Re: all of this closed repeater stuff

brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:

>Yes, John, I've seen Kurt sweat and struggle to be a bozo. Apparently  
>it's quite a lot of work for him.

>With you, on the other hand, being a bozo seems to come effortlessly.

Coming from you, Brian, that is the ultimate compliment.

Thank you,  
John

--

John De Armond, WD40QC	Interested in high performance mobility?
Performance Engineering Magazine(TM)	Interested in high tech and computers?
Marietta, Ga	Send ur snail-mail address to
jgd@dixie.com	perform@dixie.com for a free sample mag
Need Usenet public Access in Atlanta? Write Me for info on Dixie.com.	

-----

Date: Fri, 5 Feb 1993 00:03:45 GMT  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!  
gatech!concert!unccsun.uncc.edu!wlhamaty@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan29.233654.29325@newshost.lanl.gov>,  
<C1r82s.A7x@unccsun.uncc.edu>, <C1vtq7.B2v@wang.com>ch  
Subject : Re: My call sign : (

In article <C1vtq7.B2v@wang.com> dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:

>

>>Yes, you do have to keep the CSCE indefinitely, or at least until you get  
>>your General.

>

>It depends on what he wants to do. If the FCC cites him for operating  
>beyond his privileges, they have the burden of proof that he is

>operating illegally. In such a case, they would produce the 610  
>and whatever test materials they had, and thereby he'd be cleared.  
>In order to upgrade to General, he would have to take a new code  
>test (13 wpm) so the CSCE for 5 wpm would have no value. Probably  
>the only thing he would need the CSCE for is if he want to guest  
>operate somewhere and needed to show that he was authorized.  
>

Okay, I was going by the book! Practically, the probablility of ever being  
asked to produce the CSCE is nearly zero. I could probably do without the  
framed license on the wall and maybe even the little card in the wallet,  
but I'm the sort that IDs on a dummy load just incase it isn't so dumb. ;-{)

--

```
[-----]
| Luke Hamaty KD4HSE          "More than gold, I love to complain."      |
| Impact Technologies Group - Trurl, from The Cyberiad                  |
|                               |                                          |
| 800-438-6017 or 704-549-1100                                         |
```

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #32

\*\*\*\*\*